UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

J.N

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/033,585	03/03/98	NAGASHIMA T	862.2213

005514 LM31/0901
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER	
POON, K	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2724	6

DATE MAILED: 09/01/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/033,585	Takeyuki Nagashima
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
King Y. Poon	2724

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasanuma et al..

Regarding claim 1, 12: Sasanuma teaches an image processing apparatus (see #108 of fig. 20) communicating (bidirectional, see the 2-way arrow of fig. 23) with an image output unit (see printer unit B of fig. 20 and column 13 line 25-26) having a function of measuring a condition (see column 16 line 20-25 and "gradation" of column 14 line 15-20). The image processing apparatus can input an image from the CCD and output an image to be print by the printer (see fig. 20), process color image data, (see column 15 line 6), and set a color processing condition for the printer. (See S58 of fig. 26) Even though Sasanuma does not specifically disclose a communication mean, it would have been obvious that in doing communications, the image processing apparatus needs a communication mean, or otherwise, there would not have been any communications.

Regarding claim 2: Sasanuma teaches that the image output unit has a printer engine unit (see fig. 23) and to measure a change of environment (Status) in the print engine. (See column 16 line 7-25)and a RAM (see #32 of fig. 23) to store image output unit information.

Regarding claim 3: Sasanuma teaches to measure a plurity patches output by the image output unit. (See column 15 line 5-8)

Regarding claim 4: Sasanuma teaches to convert image data into multi valued data (see "gradation" of column 14 line 15) corresponding to a type of recording medium, (see "paper" of column 14 line 53) and to perform color processing. (See "gradation correction" of column 14 line 26.

Regarding claim 5: Sasanuma teaches to quantize the image data. (See "gradation" of column 14 line 53)

Regarding claim 6: Sasanuma teaches that a user could determine whether or not the color processing is done in accordance with the condition. (See column 19 line 4-9)

Regarding claim 14: Sasanuma teaches to use a ROM (computer readable storage medium to store the program to control the apparatus of claim 1. (See # 216 of fig. 21)

3. Claims 7-10, 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasanuma et al. In view of Maniwa et al..

Regarding claim 7, 13: Sasanuma teaches an image processing apparatus (see #108 of fig. 20) communicating (bidirectional, see the 2-way arrow of fig. 23) with a printer (see unit B of fig. 20 and column 13 line 25-26) having a function of measuring a condition (see column 16

line 20-25 and "gradation" of column 14 line 15-20). The image processing apparatus can input an image from the CCD and output an image to be print by the printer (see fig. 20), process color image data, (see column 15 line 6), and set a color processing condition for the printer. (See S58 of fig. 26) Sasanuma does not teach to use a server in a network environment to monitor the status of the printer and to communicate with the printer. Maniwa teaches to connect the image processing unit to a printer using a network through a server which is used to monitor the status of a printer and to communicate with a printer. (See abstract and table 1 and 2 in column 9) Sasanuma and Maniwa are combinable because they are from the same area of printers. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect the image processing unit to a printer using a network through a server which is used to monitor the status of a printer and to communicate with a printer. The suggestion of doing so would have allowed many users to use the printer in different locations which is desirable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sasanuma and Maniwa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Regarding claim 8: Russell teaches that the server is used to manage the print job for the printer. (See abstract)

Regarding claim 9: Sasanuma teaches that the printer unit has a printer engine unit (see fig. 23) and to measure a change of environment (Status) in the print engine. (See column 16 line 7-25)and a RAM (see #32 of fig. 23) to store printer information.

Regarding claim 10: Sasanuma teaches that a user could determine whether or not the color processing is done in accordance with the condition. (See column 19 line 4-9)

Regarding claim 15: Sasanuma teaches to use a ROM (computer readable storage medium to store the program to control the apparatus of claim 7. (See # 216 of fig. 21)

4. Claims 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa et al. In view of Sasanuma et al..

Regarding claims 11: Maniwa teaches an image processing method in a network system (see fig. 1) having an image output apparatus (see #110 of fig. 1) communicating with a server (#104 of fig. 1) with conditions (see column 9 line 20-24), a server with storage for storing conditions information and managing a print job, (see abstract) and a network terminal (see client machine of column 27 line 37) for outputting print jobs for a client (user) and to receive messages (conditions) stored in the server (see column 27 line 62). The client machine also performs image processing by forming image data in a print job. Maniwa does not teach a condition measurement function for the image output apparatus and that image processing would include color processing. Sasanuma teaches to use a gradation (condition measurement function) (see column 14 line 15) to check the condition of a printer (image output apparatus) and that the image processing would include color processing. (See column 14 line 56) Sasanuma and Maniwa are combinable because they are from the same area of printers. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a condition measurement function for the image output apparatus and that image processing would include

color processing. The suggestion of doing so would have allowed the printer to perform automatic correction and to print color prints which are desirable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa and Sasanuma to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892 or to Supervisor Mr. David Moore whose phone number is (703) 308-7452.

DAVID K. MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

August 19, 1999